



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/903,982

07/11/2001

David A. Hose

42365-00300

9414

33623

7590

06/23/2004

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP/OPENWAVE SYSTEM
INC.

3151 SOUTH VAUGHN WAY

SUITE 411

AURORA, CO 80014

EXAMINER

D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

8

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,982

Applicant(s)

HOSE ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M. D'Agosta

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1-3-02 is in compliance and accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because there is a reference to #102 in Figure 2 which does not exist – the examiner believes this to be a typo with the reference being to #202 (see page 13, L14). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters “200 and 202 (in figure 2)” have been used to designate both a first/second location and a first/second area for a mobile user – the examiner proposes naming them 200a/202a and 200b/200b . A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: *the statement “storing an identifier for a mobile unit of interest to a user” is confusing to the examiner – it is interpreted as a way in which to identify the mobile user (eg. a phone number as defined in claim 12) – so it would be more clear if it just stated “storing an identifier for a mobile unit”.* Appropriate correction is required. Failure to correct will lead to a USC 112 rejection.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:

1. The term "invention" should be removed because the application has not been patented and the Abstract puts forth only disclosure of the system.
2. The numbers in parentheses should be removed (eg. (400), (402), (404), etc.).
3. The abstract is too long (is limited to approximately 150 words).
Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 9, 12-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richton US 6,650,902 (hereafter Richton).

As per **claim 1**, Richton teaches a method for use in providing services based on the locations of mobile units in a wireless network (title, abstract), said wireless network including a switch structure for use in selectively routing communications (figure 2, #220 is a wireless switching station) between network users (#203-1, -2, -3 etc.) and a processing platform associated with the switch structure (figure 2, #221 is a location-based server), said method comprising the steps of:

Providing a location based services application running, at least in part, on the processing platform associated with the switch structure (figure 2 shows separate location server #221 and switch #220);

Defining at least one geographic reference for said location based services application (C4, L3-14 teaches a database server containing locations that define areas of interest to the mobile);

Storing an identifier for a mobile unit of interest to a user (C3, L9-18 teaches storing a mobile unit's phone number to identify it);

Monitoring a location of said mobile unit, using said location based services application and said identifier of said mobile unit, to identify an attainment of a predetermined relationship of said mobile unit relative to said geographic reference, said attainment being defined by a change of status with respect to said predetermined relationship (C2, L59 to C3, L8 teaches monitoring the mobile's location and/or C4, L28-44 teaches monitoring mobile when within a certain distance of an airport); and

Transmitting service information regarding said mobile unit in response to said attainment of said predetermined relationship of said mobile unit relative to said geographic reference (C4, L28-53 teaches transmitting airline data to a user when near the airport).

As per **claim 2**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of defining said geographic reference comprises receiving subscriber specific information from said user regarding said geographic reference (C8, L45-58) and said step of storing comprises indexing information regarding said geographic reference to said identifier (C3, L9-62 teaches geographic references being stored in a user profile, eg. as given by a user, and instructions regarding what data is to be transmitted to the user when near said geographic reference AND C8, L45 to C9, L50 teaches the entire process of inputting preferences and indexing/correlating when to respond and with what data to send which reads on the claim).

As per **claim 3**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of defining comprises identifying a geographic area for which said user desires to receive notification upon one of:

a) entry of said mobile unit into said identified geographic area (C4, L40-44); and

b) exit of said mobile unit from said identified area (C5, L6-10 teaches knowing when a user approaches or leaves a defined geographic reference, eg. home/office);
said step of transmitting comprises providing notification to said user of said boundary crossing event (C4, L40-44 teaches the system understanding a defined boundary from a geographic reference, eg. being within 1, 10 or 15 miles of the airport, and sending a notification to the user which reads on the claim).

As per **claim 4**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of defining comprises receiving zone location information regarding a service zone referenced to a first topology system and expressing said zone information in terms of a second topology system of said location based services application (C8, L45 to C9, L15 teaches the system using multiple zone topologies, including street addresses, LAT/LONG, UTM for GIS mapping and/or GPS [C9, L37-50] and setting a "proximity threshold" [eg. in miles, etc] to trigger data transmission to a mobile user therefore providing the ability to use two or more topologies).

As per **claim 5**, Richton teaches claim 4 wherein the first topology comprises a street grid (C8, L50-55 teaches use of street address/grid).

As per **claim 9**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of monitoring comprises storing first location information regarding a first location of the mobile at a first time, obtaining second location information regarding a second location of said mobile at a second time and comparing first location to second location to identify attainment of said predetermined relationship (abstract teaches monitoring a traveler's location to a specific location, eg. airport, and sending data when "within a certain distance" which inherently requires the system to periodically check at first/second times to determine if/when the user is near a predefined geographic location).

As per **claim 12**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said unit is a telephone and said step of storing an identifier comprises storing an MIN/ESN (C3, L9-18 teaches storing a mobile unit's phone number to identify it).

As per **claim 13**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of transmitting service information comprises transmitting said service information to said mobile unit (abstract teaches sending airline information to the mobile as it approaches the airport).

As per **claim 15**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of transmitting service information comprises transmitting said service information to a separate application that is registered with said location based services application to receive boundary crossing information regarding said mobile unit (C15, L3-13 teaches sending email, voicemail or facsimile messages to the user when they near home which reads on the claim).

As per **claim 16**, Richton teaches claim 1 wherein said step of transmitting service information comprises transmitting a message to said user providing notice of a boundary crossing event (C5, L5-15 teaches being within a certain distance of the airport and receiving airline information).

As per **claim 17**, Richton teaches claim 16 wherein said message comprises one of voice, text or graphical message (C15, L3-15 teaches converting email, voicemail, fax, etc. into a format that the user can receive on their mobile unit).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jokiahho et al. US 5,889,770 (hereafter Jokiahho).

As per **claim 6**, Richton teaches claim 4 wherein said second topology comprises one of a geographical coordinate system (C8, L50-55 teaches use of LAT/LONG) **but is silent on** and a system of wireless network subdivision identifiers

Richton does teach location determination via the cellular system and "triangulation, etc". whereby the examiner could interpret "etc." to mean subdivision identifiers.

Jokiahho teaches using cell identifiers (eg. subdivision identifiers) to locate a mobile user's position (The data service center compares the identifier of the cell or group of cells contained by the received data packet with a previous identifier stored in the data service database, and if it notices that the identifier has changed, it updates the location data of the mobile station in the database with the new identifier. This procedure makes it possible to significantly diminish or even entirely avoid the signalling relating to location updating during packet data transmission (C3, L57 to C4, L5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that cell/subdivision identifiers are used, to provide location determination that does not add considerable load to the cell system for location determination purposes.

As per **claim 10**, Richton teaches claim 9 and monitoring first/second locations and comparing to determine location of the mobile (abstract teaches monitoring a traveler's location to a specific location, eg. airport, and sending data when "within a certain distance" which inherently requires the system to periodically check at first/second times to determine if/when the user is near a predefined geographic location) **but is silent on** a first zone identifier for a particular zone, a second zone identifier for a particular service zone and comparing comprises determining whether said first zone identifier is the same as the second zone identifier.

Jokiaho teaches using cell identifiers (eg. zone identifiers) to locate a mobile user's position (The data service center compares the identifier of the cell or group of cells contained by the received data packet with a previous identifier stored in the data service database, and if it notices that the identifier has changed, it updates the location data of the mobile station in the database with the new identifier. This procedure makes it possible to significantly diminish or even entirely avoid the signalling relating to location updating during packet data transmission (C3, L57 to C4, L5). Hence, instead of monitoring a user's location via GPS, etc., one skilled would use zone identifiers to determine location.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that cell/zone identifiers are used, to provide location determination that does not add considerable load to the cell system for location determination purposes.

Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hoshen US 5,461,390 (hereafter Hoshen).

As per **claim 7**, Richton teaches claim 1 **but is silent on** wherein said step of providing a location based application comprises providing an application for allowing a person of authority to monitor the movements of one of a person or vehicle associated with said mobile unit.

Hoshen teaches a locator system that can determine the location of a person who has a wireless transceiver attached to them (eg. for house arrest) which transmits a signal to law enforcement should the person not be within an area that they are supposed to be in (abstract, figures 1-3, 5 and C1, 54 to C2, L11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that the application allows a person of authority to monitor the movements of one of a person/vehicle associated with said mobile unit, to provide means to track a mobile user and ensure they are within specified areas at all times.

Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Linkola US 6,516,190 (hereafter Linkola).

As per **claim 8**, Richton teaches claim 1 **but is silent on** wherein said step of providing a location based services application comprises providing an application for setting a billing parameter for use of said wireless network by said mobile unit.

Linkola teaches Rate charging rules whereby the system determines the cell in which the mobile station is currently located and determines whether the mobile station was in a denoted special rate area at the time that its location was most recently determined. If so, then the object informs the network that the call is entitled to the special rate. Disposed in a billing center is a billing object, to which the locator object sends data indicating whether the call was initiated from a cell or area in which a special rate is applicable, as well as data identifying the particular call. The second object receives the billing records generated by the mobile switching center, which also contain call identifying data, and compares the call-specific data in those records with the data sent by the first object. In this way, the second object can identify from the billing records those calls that are entitled to a special rate, regardless of whether the mobile station has moved during call setup from the original cell into a cell where another rate, e.g. a higher rate, is applicable (abstract, figure 3 and C4, L60 to C5, L44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that an application for setting a billing parameter for use of said wireless network by said mobile unit is used, to provide means for the system to locate the user and provide special billing rates if available.

Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pepe et al. US 5,742,905 (hereafter Pepe).

As per **claim 14**, Richton teaches claim 1 **but is silent on** wherein said step of transmitting service information comprises transmitting said service information to a data network node associated with said subscriber, said data network node being separate from said mobile unit.

Pepe teaches a personal communications internetworking (title, abstract and figures 1-3) whereby subscribers are assigned a single personal telephone for both voice and data communication. An example of a few of the options that PCI may provide for the subscriber are to:

- send the message to the subscriber's wireless PDA;
- send the message to the subscriber's wireline computer at home;
- send the message to the destination text messaging system at the office;
- send a notification of an incoming message to the wireless data terminal and the actual message to the text messaging system.
- send the message to any or all of the above (C25, L8- 40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that service information is transmitted to a data network node associated with said subscriber, said data network node being separate from said mobile unit, to provide means for sending the information to multiple locations/nodes where the user may be currently located.

Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Day US 6,463,273 (hereafter Day).

As per **claim 18**, Richton teaches 1 wherein said step of transmitting service information comprises transmitting one of local service information (C13, L24-52 and C14, L1-31 discusses transmitting local traffic information) **but is silent on** local emergency information to said mobile unit.

Day teaches a wireless warning system to alert and advise selected users to potential or existing emergencies within a geographic area covered by a service provider, where the system operates on the principle of a common or party-line pager communication link. The system comprises a user program in which each selected user has a coded party-line number that is activated by an emergency agency to alert said user of the emergency. The service provider, in communication with various emergency detection stations, such as police, fire, weather, etc., receives the emergency information regarding the geographic area for the emergency, and transmits the information simultaneously to all users. By this system the users are quickly advised of an emergency at a location, i.e., permanent home, mobile home, office, or school, or other location as more clearly defined hereafter (C2, L35-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Richton, such that users are notified of local emergencies, to provide means for said users to be alerted of an emergency and avoid/evacuate the area.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claim 19 allowed. The claim recites a highly specific design that is not found in the prior art cited by the examiner and is therefore considered novel.

2. Claim 11 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art cited by the examiner does not

teach wherein said step of monitoring further comprises defining a geometrical element interconnecting a first location of said first location information and a second location of said second location information and determining whether there is an intersection between said geometrical element and a boundary of a service zone. The prior art cited does not attempt to geometrically interconnect two location points of the mobile and then compare them to a location of a boundary line to determine if it has been crossed. In order to do this, the system would need to track at least two user locations, interconnect them "mathematically" and then determine "mathematically" whether the connection crosses over a geographically defined boundary line.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

1. Tell et al. US 5,774,802 teaches billing in a wireless system.
2. Suprounov US 6,421,009 teaches mobile position tracking.
3. Barzegar et al. US 5,559,520 teaches wireless location.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 703-306-5426. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'SMD' or similar, located below the printed name 'SMD'.